

not the same now as they were then because at the present time we have British Columbia to look after and if war were declared between Great Britain and Russia our first duty would be to look after British Columbia which might be attacked by Russia from the Pacific ocean.

I am well aware that for expressing the opinion which I did express the other day and which I repeat on the floor of this House, I have shocked many and many a good Conservative mind. I was accused of treason. Charges of treason are familiar to me. I have heard them in my own province time and again, and I have heard them in the province of Ontario. Charges of treason are very easily manufactured. The other day I was speaking in Toronto. I was saying that we were British subjects, subjects of His Majesty the King, and in speaking of the sovereignty of the King I called in the use of the word suzerain, and in doing this I find that I shocked many a tender soul. I shocked the tender soul of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) for one. When reviewing my speech a few days afterwards, he spoke as follows:

"Some rather foolish, even mischievous talk, has been indulged along these lines. It has been asserted that we have wrested our fiscal autonomy, our political autonomy, even our naval autonomy, from Britain, and the latest addition is practically our autonomy in our international relations. After this, all we have to do in bowing our knee and saluting King Edward is to call him, not sovereign, but suzerain. It is a mistake which creates false impressions.

"It these utterances are merely for the sake of rhetorical adornment they are but foolish. If, however, they are studied and serious, they are revolutionary. We cannot have absolute autonomy in any of these and remain in the empire."

Well, is my hon. friend in this merely playing on syllables? If I had said 'sovereign' that was all perfectly loyal, but I said 'suzerain' and that smacks of disloyalty! Sir, I am sorry to say to my hon. friend that I rather rubbed my eyes when I saw his criticism. I do not pretend to be a master of the English language, but I think I know something of it, and I have always understood that if there is any difference between 'sovereignty' and 'suzerainty' it is merely a shadow and that it is used by men of greatest eminence indifferently as applying to the same condition of things. I am sorry that I have to ask my hon. friend to brush up his classics. Would he be satisfied with the authority of Sir Walter Scott? Would Sir Walter

Scott satisfy his literary aestheticism, or would he be satisfied that Sir Walter was sufficient of a Tory not to harrow his imperial soul? Let me ask my hon. friend, as I said a moment ago, to brush up his classics. Let me ask him to read again 'Quentin Durward' and he will find on the same page Sir Walter Scott using the expression 'sovereign' and 'suzerain' as applying to the same condition of things and to the same man. In the thirty-fifth chapter of 'Quentin Durward' my hon. friend will find that Lady Isabelle addressing the Duke of Burgundy, uses this language:

"My lord, duke and sovereign," said Lady Isabelle, summoning up all her courage, 'I observe your Grace's commands, and submit to them.' . . . 'My submission,' she said, 'only respected those lands and estates which your Grace's ancestors gave to mine, and which I resign to the house of Burgundy, if my sovereign thinks my disobedience in this matter renders me unworthy to hold them.'

Again:

"My lord," she replied, still undismayed, 'I am before my Suzerain, and, I trust, a just one.'

I think that after this I can be freed from the hypercritical fastidiousness of my hon. friend both in point of philology and imperialism.

Mr. FOSTER. Will you let me see the 'Durward' extract?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes. The great mistake which is made by those imperialists of the school of my hon. friend is to confound the condition which exists in Great Britain with that which prevails in the colonies. England belongs to the circle of nations which is known as the European concert, it is one of the four or five nations of Europe that are always watching one another. There are no public works to carry on there, and she can devote herself and her resources to armaments. But, the colonies are not in that condition. Our chief consideration is public works, to develop the resources of our country, and therefore I say that this is a mistake which should not be made by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House? They are not the first ones to make that mistake. England made the same mistake in the eighteenth century when she tried to force the American colonies to contribute to her armament by taxation. They protested, but their protests were not heeded. They protested again and at last, though they were a loyal population, they were driven to distraction and they